

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,192	12/20/2001	Gyanesh P. Khare	· -	9714
7590 08/30/2006 RICHMOND, HITCHCOCK, FISH & DOLLAR P.O. Box 2443			EXAMINER	
			LANGEL, WAYNE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Bartlesville, Ol	74005		1754	TALERIVONIBER
			1734	
			DATE MAILED: 08/30/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/027,192	KHARE ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Wayne Langel	1754			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATES IN THE PROVINCE OF THE MAILING DATES IN THE PROVINCE OF THE MAILING THE M	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		•				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 Ag	oril 2006.				
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.					
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>18-31 and 34-55</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)[Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-17,32 and 33 is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Applicati	ion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by the E	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the o					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex-	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).			
a)	a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	or the certified copies not receive	u.			
Attachmen	t(s)					
	te of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
3) 🔲 Infor	te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/027,192

Art Unit: 1754

Applicants' traverse of the restriction requirement has been considered, but is not deemed persuasive. Applicants' argument, that all art classes referred to in the restriction requirement properly would be searched even if the Group II and III claims did not exist, is not convincing, since there is more involved in examinig a patent application besides searching, such as formulating rejections and evaluating applicants' arguments. Applicants' argument, that all groups of claims clearly relate to the removal of sulfur from a hydrocarbon stream, is not convincing, since there is no sulfur removal step recited in the claims of Groups I and II. Accordingly the restriction requirement is made FINAL

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Khare et al '117. No distinction is seen between the sorbent composition disclosed by Khare et al '117, and that recited in applicants' claims. Khare et al '117 discloses a sorbent composition which comprises zinc oxide and a Group VIII metal oxide promoter. (See col. 1, line 60 to col.

Application/Control Number: 10/027,192

Art Unit: 1754

4, line 28.) Khare et al '117 discloses at col. 3, lines 55-58 that the promoter can be added to the sorbent composition in the form of the elemental metal, and further discloses at col. 4, lines 23-25 that at least a portion of the elemental metal is converted to a metal oxide. Accordingly Khare et al '117 anticipates claims 1-17, 32 and 33, since the reference contemplates the presence of elemental in the composition in teaching that not all of the metal needs to be oxidized to the metal oxide. In any event, it would be obvious to refrain from oxidizing all the metal to the metal oxide in the process of Khare et al '117, since Khare et al '117 suggests that it is not necessary to oxidize all of the metal. Khare et al '117 further teaches at col. 4, lines 29 and 30 that the sorbent composition is subjected to a steaming treatment.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne Langel whose telephone number is 571-272-1353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8 am - 3:30 pm Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/027,192

Art Unit: 1754

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Wayne Langel Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1754